

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ENEDINA OVERSTREET,

Plaintiff,

vs.

WAL-MART STORES, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No.: 2:22-cv-01252-GMN-EJY

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”), (ECF No. 12), of United States Magistrate Judge Elayna J. Youchah, which recommends denying Plaintiff Enedina Overstreet’s (“Plaintiff’s”) Motion to Amend, (ECF No. 7), for filing it in bad faith.

A party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a United States Magistrate Judge made pursuant to Local Rule IB 1-4. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2. Upon the filing of such objections, the Court must make a *de novo* determination of those portions to which objections are made. *Id.* The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the Magistrate Judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); D. Nev. R. IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object, however, the Court is not required to conduct “any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection.” *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985) (citing 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge’s R&R where no objections have been filed. *See, e.g., United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003).

Here, no objections were filed, and the deadline to do so has passed. (*See* Min. Order, ECF No. 12) (setting an October 13, 2022, deadline for objections).

1 Accordingly,

2 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation, (ECF No. 12), is  
3 **ACCEPTED and ADOPTED** in full.

4 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion to Amend, (ECF No. 7), is  
5 **DENIED.**

6 Dated this 3 day of January, 2023.

7  
8 

9 \_\_\_\_\_  
Gloria M. Navarro, District Judge  
United States District Court